

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This response is made to the most recent rejection dated October 26, 2009, and a subsequent conversation with Examiner Bui, which conversation was greatly appreciated by Applicants' attorney. Claims 20-37 remain pending in this application.

Claims 20 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. It seems that the Examiner did not understand "a said curved portion" in each of the claims. Now, the claims reflect that "said curved portion" (removing the word "a") is claimed.

Claims 20-29 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(c) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Globerman, U.S. 5,776,161. As a preliminary matter, it seems that the rejection is written as if all the claims 20-37 were rejected using Globerman. Applicants have treated this rejection as such. Regarding the rejection itself, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has oriented the stent in Globerman incorrectly. For instance, the "ring" "ABCD" is *neither* a "cylindrical ring" nor a "cylindrical spring," as claimed. It does not lie along the longitudinal axis, but rather lies orthogonal to the longitudinal axis. This can best be seen by taking Figure 27 in conjunction with Figure 20, as required by the Specification of Globerman. In fact, the configuration of Globerman *must* be analogized to the current claims by viewing elements such as ABCD as if it were the connector members of the claims. As a result, these connectors (in Globerman) do not connect a ring or a spring at any of the end portions of the struts of Globerman. These connectors attach somewhere near the middle of a ring or a spring. As a result, the properly construed embodiment of Globerman does not anticipate or render obvious Claims 20-37. In particular, as explained to the Examiner, the connectors are claimed to be straight, which is nowhere disclosed in Globerman. This fact was also recognized by the Examiner in the Advisory Action of March 1, 2010.

The claims were also rejected under using an obviousness type double patenting rejection. When there are no further art rejections, Applicants will consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer.

Serial No. 10/791,345
JJI0049USCON

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 10-0750/JJI0049USCON/PAC for any such fees. A two-month extension of time is requested herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Paul A. Coletti/
Paul A. Coletti
Reg. No. 32,019

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-2815
Dated: March 25, 2010
Customer No. 27777